

Remarks/Arguments

The Office Action of November 20, 2007 and the references cited therein have been carefully studied and reviewed, and in view of the foregoing Amendment and following representations, reconsideration is respectfully requested.

The drawing whose portions were originally labeled as FIG. 2 has been replaced with an identical drawing whose portions are now labeled as FIG. 2a and FIG. 2b, respectively. In addition, the new FIG. 2a includes reference numeral 62a in place of reference numeral 62 employed in the original FIG. 2. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the objection to the drawings be withdrawn.

Also, the specification has been amended to correct minor errors, including that noted by the Examiner in paragraph 0048. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the objection to the disclosure be withdrawn.

Next, claims 1 – 16 have been canceled. New claims 17 – 38 have been added. The new claims make it clearer that the invention is directed to a technique of forming an oil-repellent film which, as described in the specification, may be used in the manufacturing of a spindle motor. Also, the new claims make it clearer that the technique involves removing excess oil repellent. As described in the specification, the excess oil repellent may be that portion of the oil repellent which if otherwise left in the predetermined area would cause the film of oil repellent to form outside the desired area. Accordingly, the scope of new claims 17 – 38 would be readily understood by those of ordinary skill in the art reviewing Applicants' original specification and as such, the presentation of the new claims in lieu of claims 1 – 16 renders the rejection of claims 1 and 13 under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, moot.

Finally, the new claims clearly patentably distinguish the present invention over the reference to Iwamoto et al. (JP 2—1-232289).

For example, new independent claim 17 recites supplying a solution of oil repellent through a supply member (14, 74) of an oil repellent supply apparatus and

onto a component (58, 60) within a predetermined area thereof, and **moving the predetermined area of the component (58, 60) and the supply member (14, 74)** of the oil repellent supply apparatus **relative to one another** (arcuate arrows in FIG. 6 and 10) to thereby coat the predetermined area of the component (58, 60) with the oil repellent.

Similarly, new independent claim 28 recites **supplying the oil repellent solution** through the supply member (14, 74) while **the predetermined area of the component (58, 60) and the supply member (14, 74) are rotated relative to one another** to coat the predetermined area with the oil repellent. In addition, new independent claim 28 also recites **removing excess oil repellent from the predetermined area of the component (58, 60) while the predetermined area of the component (58, 60) and a removal member (16, 76) of oil repellent removal apparatus are rotated relative to one another**.

The method disclosed by Iwamoto does not include at least these steps. In the method of Iwamoto, oil repellent is supplied to the predetermined area (inner peripheral surface) of the component 5 while the component sits stationary on the supply member (head) 10 of the oil supply apparatus. Specifically, the interior of the component 5 is merely flooded with the oil repellent such that the oil repellent fills a crevice created between the inner peripheral surface of the component 5 and a pillar-shaped projection 12 of the supply member 10 while the component 5 remains stationary (paragraph 0017).

In the Office Action, the Examiner refers to the bore section 5a of component 5 making a “relative movement” because the profile of the bore section 5a varies non-linearly in the axial direction of the component 5 (see paragraph 0014 of Iwamoto and FIG. 4 for what is obviously meant by the translation’s description of the bore section 5 varying “nonlinearly”). With all due respect, this position is untenable as it is not seen how the bore section 5a, i.e., that section of the component which includes the inner peripheral surface of the component 5, can make movement relative to itself.

In any case, the fact that the bore section 5a varies non-linearly in the axial direction of the component 5 can not be reasonably read on the above-noted limitations in Applicants' claims regarding relative movement between the component being coated and the supply member (14, 74) and/or removal member (16, 76) of the supply and removal apparatus.

Thus, the Iwamoto reference does not anticipate Applicants' new claims 17 and 28 under 35 USC 102.

Accordingly, early reconsideration and allowance of the claims are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,
VOLENTINE & WHITT, PLLC
/Adam C. Volentine/
Adam C. Volentine
Reg. No. 33289

Attachment: One (1) replacement sheet of drawings

Customer No. 20987
Volentine & Whitt, PLLC
Suite 1260
11951 Freedom Drive
Reston, VA 20190
Tel. (571) 283-0720

Date: February 20, 2008